

REMARKS

The final rejections of claims 1-10 was addressed in the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION WITH AMENDMENT filed March 31, 2003 and should be consulted in order to understand Applicants' position regarding the final rejection.

In this AMENDMENT, claim 11 has been canceled and replaced with new claim 12 which specifies that the cutouts extend in the planar direction of and not in the first dielectric layer. That is, to avoid and confusion it is now clear that the cutouts are formed in a conductive layer which is attached to the dielectric layer and not in the dielectric layer. (See line 1 on page 7 of the specification).


In the Advisory Action of April 22, 2003, the Examiner stated: "The reference [Bellee] does shoe different dimensions for slots (40) and (45) which can be seen in Fig. 5". Fig. 5 of Bellee et al shows slots that are uniform and not of different dimensions. The written description of slots 40 and 45 does not indicated that they are different.

Application No.: 09/901,636
Art Unit: 2856

Attorney Docket: MALZ3001/FJD

The Examiner is urged to reconsider this rejection based on Locke in view of Bellee et al and to allow claims 1-10 and 12.

Respectfully submitted,



Felix J. D'Ambrosio
Reg. No. 25,721

January 28, 2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, VA 22314 - 1176
(703) 683-0500